

University of Groningen

More than words: Recognizing speech of people with Parkinson's disease

Verkhodanova, Vass

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.183425053](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.183425053)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2021

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Verkhodanova, V. (2021). *More than words: Recognizing speech of people with Parkinson's disease*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.
<https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.183425053>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

More than words: Recognizing speech of people with Parkinson's disease

Vass Verkhodanova



**university of
groningen**

campus fryslân



The work described in this thesis has been carried under the auspices of Campus Fryslân and the Research School of Behavioural and Cognitive Neurosciences (BCN) at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands.



Cover design by Vass Verkhodanova

Illustrations by Vass Verkhodanova as homage to Utagawa Hiroshige and Fujishima Takeji

Layout is adapted from Moritz Beller's version of a PhD thesis LaTeX template (<https://github.com/Inventitech/phd-thesis-template>).

An **electronic version** of this dissertation is available at <https://research.rug.nl/>

Printed by Ipskamp Printing, Enschede



university of
 groningen

More than words: recognizing speech of people with Parkinson's disease

PhD thesis

to obtain the degree of PhD at the
 University of Groningen
 on the authority of the
 Rector Magnificus Prof. C. Wijmenga
 and in accordance with
 the decision by the College of Deans.

This thesis will be defended in public on

Thursday 4 November 2021 at 11.00 hours

by

Vasilisa Verkhodanova

born on 7 May 1990
 in Leningrad, USSR

Supervisors

Prof. W.M. Lowie
Dr. R. Jonkers

Co-supervisor

Dr. M.L. Coler

Assessment Committee

Prof. M.C.J. Keijzer
Prof. M. De Letter
Prof. B.A.M. Maassen

To my father, **Dr. Oleg Verkhodanov**,
in loving memory.
You always believed in me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would never have been possible without all the support and help from many people. Reflecting upon everything that led to the final step of my PhD journey, the defense, I feel extremely lucky and privileged for all the opportunities I was granted and for all the experience and knowledge I have gained. But this journey would not happen without my supervision team who believed in the topic of my dissertation and in me. Thank you.

First, I would like to express my infinite gratitude to Prof. Wander Lowie, my promotor, whose expertise and guidance were invaluable for shaping and balancing this multifaceted work. Your insightful feedback and thought-provoking questions always inspired me, pushed my thinking and work to an entirely next level. I am also extremely grateful to Dr. Roel Jonkers, my co-promotor, for providing me with a crucial clinical linguist perspective and a real life approach. Your critical view on the feasibility of my ideas and plans were an anchor for my research endeavours and were vital for the success of this research. Finally, I am indebted to Dr. Matt Coler, my daily supervisor, who believed in me well before my PhD journey started and with whom I am lucky to share a last-minute and flexible attitude, which allowed me to experiment with deadlines and conference submissions. Thank you for always reading my texts, for trusting my ideas and for inspiring me to always be more critical in my thinking and more precise in my writing.

Furthermore, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my assessment committee: Prof. Merel Keijzer, Prof. Miet De Letter, and Prof. Ben Maassen. Thank you for taking the time to read and evaluate my work. Your comments helped me improve the quality of my manuscript.

I am profoundly grateful to Prof. Kees de Bot for becoming the “Godfather” to the research I have conducted in my PhD. Thank you for providing me with both academic advice and the emotional support of a friend. I am blessed in having the opportunity to work with you and to learn from you.

My research relies on dysarthric speech recordings, and it would not have been possible without the help and support of a number of people. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Natasha Maurits, Dr. Bauke de Jong, and Sanne Timmermans at University Medical Center Groningen for all the invaluable advice and help in data collection and management. I am thankful to Niek Verwey and Parkinson’s nurses at Medical Center Leeuwarden for their help with data and patients inclusion, even though COVID-19 prevented us from collecting data in Frisian. Also, I would like to thank my amazing research assistants for their contributions to building the speech corpus – Lea Busweiler and Marjon Witteveen.

I also wish to warmly thank all the wonderful people of Campus Fryslân (CF) for that remarkable sense of a friendly shoulder, shared dreams and purpose. When I joined CF, every staff member could sit around a single table during our lunch time, and it feels so special to have been able to witness how CF is growing and how those dreams are coming true. I want to specifically thank our diverse and versatile CF PhD community that filled my PhD life with stories to tell. From a small group sitting in the attic at Sophialaan, the CF PhDs grew into a big community! I thank you for sharing the attic with me in the beginning and an attic-like open space in the end of my journey, thank you for participating in my experiments, for your support, openness and hugs. I am grateful to have met you and to have accumulated many fun memories together. I am also happy to consider many of you my friends!

Every PhD student knows that doing PhD is hard. And I am grateful to all my wonderful friends who made my PhD journey easier. Matt, Goffe, Nanna, thank you for making me feel welcome in a new and unfamiliar country, without you I would not have been where I am now. Amaranta, Margo, Hendrik, Angela, Manon, Annajorien, and Donna for all the shared laughs, dinners and discussions that were so needed in the very beginning of my CF PhD life. Lise, Taís, Selen, Alex, Abe, Bram, Clarisse, thank you for that communal feeling we created as a PhD group and for the events we organized, those are the times I truly cherish. Indira, thank you so much for your constant support and for being an inspiration and a safe dancing haven to me throughout these years! Marita, thank you for your help, for our shared research times at your office, for piloting and evaluating my experiments and being my conference buddy. Liset, thank you so much for all your support, advice and for that magical comfort you extended. Suzanne, thank you for your friendship and solace and for always being there to actively listen to my troubles. Jesse, my paranymph, thank you for always grounding me, providing me with both most sensible advice and book and art references, and for formulating my thoughts better than I can do myself! Bianca, my eternal thanks to you for constantly being there for me, for keeping me sane in the darkest of hours, for always checking my Dutch texts, and now for being my paranymph! Vincent, thank you for your continuous encouragement, for teaching me that it is possible to balance between being thoughtful and having crazy fun, and for all those jokes I wish I have written down! Manya, Dasha, and Stasya, I am so grateful for you your presence in my life, your support and for all those conversations and most meaningful silences we shared.

I also owe my gratitude to so many incredible people who helped and supported me as their friend, student, colleague, or even as extension of their gratitude to my father. I cannot thank all of you enough.

And finally, I want to express my gratitude to my family, but there are no words to express it. Vova, my long-time partner-in-crime, thank so very much you for being the best tech and \TeX support ever, for those late nights of coding, checking and editing, for always listening and always having my back. I would have never done it without you. My biggest appreciation and gratitude goes to my amazing parents, Natalia and Oleg

Verkhodanovy, whose experiences in navigating people, places and situations provided me with the necessary wisdom to navigate a life of my own. Mom, thank you so much for your never-ending support and unconditional love, and for being the first to teach me how to write with meaning and impact. Dad, thank you for being not only the best dad I could wish for, but also an Academic beacon and inspiration to me. I wish you could be here to hold my thesis and witness this final chapter of my PhD journey, but I know you'd be proud. We got a little smaller without you.

Thank you everyone.

*I will never forget that man, tears running down his face,
who showed me how quickly a handful of sand pours out.*

- Ishikawa Takuboku.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
List of Figures	ix
List of Tables	xi
1 General Introduction	1
1.1 Terminological comments	3
1.2 Dissertation focus.	3
1.3 Outline of the chapters	4
I Reflections of Parkinson's disease in speech	9
2 Hypokinetic dysarthria	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Vowel articulation in German PwPD with and without mild cognitive impairment	13
2.2.1 Methods	14
2.2.2 Results	16
2.2.3 Discussion	19
2.3 Prosody and vowel articulation in spontaneous speech of Dutch PwPD	20
2.3.1 Methods	21
2.3.2 Results and discussion	22
2.4 Conclusions.	25
3 Parkinson's disease and recognition of prosody: a systematic review	27
3.1 Introduction	27
3.2 Methods: Search Strategy and Selection Criteria	29
3.3 Results	30
3.3.1 Linguistic prosody and deviant dimensions	32
3.3.2 Prosody in HD and neurologically healthy listeners	37
3.4 Discussion	40
3.5 Conclusions.	43
4 How dysarthric prosody impacts untrained listeners' recognition	45
4.1 Introduction	46
4.2 Methods	48
4.3 Results	51
4.4 Discussion and conclusions.	52

II	When people listen: speech recognition and acoustic analysis	55
5	Recognizing speech of PwPD	57
5.1	Introduction	57
5.2	Expertise in phonetics and language background.	59
5.2.1	Methods	59
5.2.2	Results	63
5.2.3	Discussion	66
5.3	SLT expertise and language background	68
5.3.1	Methods	68
5.3.2	Results	72
5.3.3	Discussion	76
6	Acoustic cues and healthiness recognition	79
6.1	Introduction	79
6.1.1	Assessment of dysarthria.	80
6.2	Focus of the current study.	83
6.3	Methods	84
6.3.1	Data analysis.	84
6.4	Random Decision Forest method	86
6.5	Results	87
6.5.1	Demographic predictors	87
6.5.2	Acoustic predictors	89
6.5.3	First language background influence on recognition predictors	90
6.6	Discussion	92
III	Time matters: longitudinal single case studies	99
7	Longitudinal story: one year	101
7.1	Introduction	101
7.2	Methods	102
7.2.1	Data collection.	102
7.2.2	Participants in recognition experiment	103
7.2.3	Stimuli	103
7.2.4	Procedure	103
7.2.5	Acoustic analyses	104
7.3	Results	105
7.3.1	Results of acoustic analyses	105
7.3.2	Rating patterns.	105
7.4	Discussion	106
8	Longitudinal story: 3.6 years	109
8.1	Introduction	109
8.2	Methods and materials	112
8.3	Results	114
8.4	Discussion	125

IV Discussion and conclusions	129
9 General discussion	131
9.1 Summary of studies and findings	132
9.2 Does HD affect linguistic prosody?	133
9.3 What influences speech recognition?	134
9.3.1 Expertise and experience	135
9.3.2 Language background	136
9.3.3 Predicting recognition of speech healthiness.	136
9.4 Does time matter?	138
9.5 Implications for Parkinson's disease in a multilingual world	139
9.6 Study limitations and future research	140
9.7 Conclusions.	142
References	145
A Data collection protocol	167
B Background and language questionnaire	179
C The full list of studies on the perception and recognition of HD, and the main features of their designs	185
C.1 Studies where people with PD served as listeners	186
C.2 Studies where neurologically healthy people served as listeners assessing speech affected by HD	189
D Pairwise comparisons for four groups in the Study II on SLT expertise and language background	195
E Descriptions of all predictors used in the RF modelling	197
F Results and analyses in a longitudinal single case study	201
G Examples of experimental settings: screenshots	205
H Source code	211
Summary	213
Samenvatting	215
Gearfetting	219
Summary in Russian: Краткое содержание	225
Curriculum Vitae	229
Groningen dissertations in linguistics (GRODIL)	231

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Male vowel space areas (German pilot).	18
2.2	Female vowel space areas (German pilot).	19
2.3	f_0 variance for the PD and HC groups (Dutch pilot)	23
2.4	VSA for the PD and HC groups (Dutch pilot)	24
3.1	PRISMA Flow Diagram explaining the records inclusion.	31
4.1	f_0 derivative differences in sentence typing.	52
5.1	Response of healthiness/unhealthiness presented as a relative rating for each speaker in an ordered fashion.	63
5.2	Question and statement accuracy scores.	65
5.3	Distribution of “I don’t know” answers	71
5.4	Accuracy of speech healthiness recognition, with and without confidence weight.	72
5.5	Accuracy of sentence type recognition	74
5.6	Accuracy of speech healthiness recognition for four listener groups, with and without confidence weight.	74
5.7	Accuracy of sentence type recognition.	75
6.1	Variable importance: demographic predictors and DT listeners	88
6.2	Variable importance: demographic predictors and DU listeners	88
6.3	Variable importance: demographic predictors and nDU listeners	89
6.4	Variable importance: acoustic predictors and DT listeners	90
6.5	Variable importance: acoustic predictors and DU listeners	91
6.6	Variable importance: acoustic predictors and nDU listeners	91
6.7	Variable importance: acoustic predictors and Germanic listeners	92
6.8	Variable importance: acoustic predictors and Slavic listeners	93
7.1	f_0 variance for all 12 sessions	106
7.2	Dependence of scores for stimuli on time for the listeners.	107
8.1	Changes in MPT, HNR and jitter over time.	115
8.2	Changes in f_0 and first two formants over time.	116
8.3	Distributions of f_0 values at three therapy stages after the deduction of the general linear trend.	117
8.4	Changes in mean f_0 in monologues in two languages over time.	119
8.5	Changes in f_0 variability in monologues in two languages over time.	120

8.6	Number of inappropriate silences in Dutch and English monologues over time.	121
8.7	Changes in mean f_0 in reading in two languages over time.	122
8.8	Changes in mean f_0 variability in reading in two languages over time. . . .	123

LIST OF TABLES

1.1	Overview of the dissertation parts and experimental studies.	5
2.1	Summary of speakers demographics (German pilot).	15
2.2	Summary of vowel measurements for each group (German pilot).	17
2.3	Summary of speakers demographics (Dutch pilot).	21
2.4	Summary of prosodic measurements for each group (Dutch pilot).	23
2.5	Summary of vowel measurements for each group (Dutch pilot).	25
3.1	List of the most affected speech dimensions related to prosody.	33
4.1	Participants demographics (Study on different dysarthrias).	48
4.2	Prosodic functions and their “perceptual correlates”.	49
4.3	Recognition accuracy for all speaker groups (Study on different dysarthrias).	51
5.1	Speaker demographics (Studies on recognition of healthiness and prosody).	60
5.2	Dutch and Czech listeners’ demographics (Study I).	61
5.3	Descriptives for the distribution of the unhealthiness recognition accuracy scores in the first listening task.	64
5.4	Descriptives for the distribution of the sentence type recognition accuracy scores in the second listening task.	66
5.5	Trained and untrained listener demographics (Study II).	69
5.6	The Fleiss’ Kappa inter-rater agreement for different listener groups.	71
5.7	Welch’s F test results per task, with and without confidence weight.	73
5.8	Welch’s F test results for the analysis of language background effect.	75
6.1	Results of the model with demographic predictors for every listener group.	87
6.2	Results of the model with acoustic predictors with accuracy and confidence intervals for every listener group	89
6.3	Results of the models for Germanic and Slavic listeners.	93
7.1	Overview of features and their measurement methods.	104
8.1	Linear regression analysis for MPT, jitter and HNR.	115
8.2	Linear regression analysis for f_0 , F1 and F2.	116
8.3	Linear regression analysis for rate measures in Dutch monologues	118
8.4	Linear regression analysis for rate measures in English monologues.	118
8.5	Linear regression analysis for f_0 means in Dutch and English monologues.	119
8.6	Linear regression analysis for f_0 variability in Dutch and English monologues.	120
8.7	Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test: f_0 in Dutch and English monologues.	121

8.8	Linear regression analysis for f_0 variability in Dutch and English reading .	124
8.9	Linear regression analysis for f_0 meansf in Dutch and English reading. . .	124
8.10	Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test: f_0 in Dutch and English reading. .	125
C.1	Studies where people with PD served as listeners	189
C.2	Studies where neurologically healthy people served as listeners assessing speech affected by HD	194
D.1	Pairwise comparisons (Tukey post hoc test results) with and without confi- dence weight.	196
E.2	Acoustic predictors.	199
E.1	Demographic predictors.	200
F.1	List of features and tasks	202
F.2	Therapy effects on rate features, monologue speech.	202
F.3	Results of the linear regression for inappropriate silences over time in Dutch and English.	203
F.4	Results of linear regression on articulation rates: Dutch and English mono- logues.	203
F.5	Results of linear regression on speech rates: Dutch and English monologues.	203
F.6	Results of the linear regression for inappropriate silences over time in Dutch and English.	203